

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, and 13-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, and 13-20 were rejected. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, no claims are canceled, claim 11 is amended, and no claims are added. No new matter is presented.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 8, 11, 13, 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kocher (US3577742) in view of Lifson (US6474087). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tinkey (US3108453). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tinkey in view of Kramer, Jr. (US228834). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tinkey in view of Lifson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tinkey in view of Kramer, Jr. and further in view of Lifson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Combined Discussion

Independent Claim 1: Only the Tinkey rejection was made against claim 1. However, Tinkey teaches the opposite positioning of that claimed in claim 1. Regarding the heat exchanger location of this claim, the Office Action at page 3, lines 7-12 referenced FIG. 7 and col. 4, lines 52-66 of Tinkey and asserted that the hypothesized rearrangement “is considered to have been an obvious matter of engineer design based upon the location of the two evaporators since the result will not be sufficiently different, i.e. both heat exchangers will provide subcooling of the refrigerant leaving the condenser regardless of which is connected to the condenser outlet first.”

Merely hypothesizing that the modification could be attempted is not a motivation for the modification.

The first and second evaporators were identified as 5 and 6, respectively. The first heat exchanger is represented by the "stabilizer shell 23" and the second by the similar unnumbered structure therebelow on the drawing sheet. Refrigerant from Tinkey's condenser, however, first enters the first heat exchanger 23 and then passes into the second heat exchanger. Col. 4, lines 65-66. Thus, Tinkey's first exchanger donor conduit is upstream of its second heat exchanger donor conduit rather than downstream as claimed in claim 1. See present FIG. 3. Tinkey teaches operation responsive to the relative back pressures associated with the two evaporators. Col. 2, lines 23-29. There is no clear indication that Tinkey would advantageously function, if at all, with the hypothesized reconfiguration of the Office action. There is no suggestion in Tinkey or the other references that one of ordinary skill would have any expectation of functionality, let alone advantage performance by making the modification.

The claims depending from claim 1 are similarly patentable. There is no suggestion to combine with Lifson. The structure of Tinkey is intimately connected to the particular piston compressor disclosed.

Independent Claim 7: Similarly, the Tinkey in view of Kramer, Jr. rejection is the only rejection made against claim 7. However, Kramer, Jr. merely shows the running of multiple evaporators in parallel on a single compressor. The Office action offered only the conclusory motivation "in order to provide refrigerant from the condenser outlet to each heat exchanger connected to the outlet of the evaporators..." Office action, page 3, second paragraph. Even if one were to attempt a combination, there is no suggestion for it to be the claimed combination. For example, one might adopt the parallel branching of Kramer, Jr. by adopting multiples of Tinkey's element 5 (each with an associated 9) but coupled in common to 23. See Tinkey FIG. 7. This would still have the series flow through the heat exchangers (cited as element 23 and the similar unnumbered element below). This would not yield the claimed branching (parallel) flow through the heat exchangers. See present FIG. 4. Thus, whereas present FIG. 3 and claim 1 identify an opposite direction of series flow to that taught by Tinkey, claim 4 is a parallel flow not suggested by Tinkey or any combination of references.

The claims depending from claim 7 are similarly patentable. There is no suggestion to combine with Lifson. The structure of Tinkey is intimately connected to the particular piston


compressor disclosed.

Independent Claims 8 and 11: Similarly, the Kocher in view of Lifson rejection is the only rejection made against independent claims 8 and 11. See present FIG. 5. The citation is insufficient for several reasons. First, Lifson was cited for "the use of an economizer connected to the intermediate port of the compressor in order to increase performance of the system in view of the teachings of Lifson." However, Kocher itself discloses an economizer in the form of a flash chamber 40 connected to the port 20 in FIG. 2. Accordingly, Kocher does not need Lifson for the teaching of an economizer. Furthermore, Kocher's FIG. 1 was cited for the primary reference. Kocher teaches the economizer (Kocher FIG. 2) and the second evaporator (Kocher FIG. 1) as alternative structures, thus teaching away from their combination.

The claims depending from claims 8 and 11 are similarly patentable.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 13-20 are in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.


Respectfully submitted,

By 
William B. Slate
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: September 27, 2006

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on September 27, 2006


Antoinette Sulle